

John Doe Times Editorial Correspondence
For The Record
14 July 1997

Martin Lindstedt: PR Flack for Nazis and "Modern Collectivist Militiaman."

Martin Lindstedt, bane of the Missouri Libertarian Party and erstwhile editor of "The Modern Militiaman", has long been an apologist for neo-Nazi and Christian Identity Phineas Priests as our "most committed" allies in the struggle against unconstitutional government. Lindstedt sings a siren song, seductive to the ear of some in the Constitutional militia movement who long for allies, any ally, in the coming fight. Those familiar with my work know that I have long warned against adopting the attitude of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend." Anyone who has read The Turner Diaries (or studied the history of predecessor collectivists such as the German National Socialist Party or the Russian Bolsheviks) understands that the punishment for such delusions on the part of putative "allies" of neo-Nazis is becoming merely the last group in a long line of Nazi victims. Instead of "the enemy of my enemy is my friend", it would be more fitting to say "with friends like these, who needs enemies?"

The correspondence below arose out of a question Mr. Lindstedt posted on the Net "Who is Larry Wayne Harris?" Mr. Harris, Buckeye Aryan Nations' adherent and fiddler with toxic baccilli was recently given a tap-on-the-wrist sentence for playing around with biowar agents he ordered through the mail. (Is Mr. Harris another example of that species we comment most frequently upon in the pages of the JDT: a Fed-friendly rent-a-nazi?)

Mr. Lindstedt apparently asked his question without recognizing in advance that Mr. Harris was one of those "allies" he would have us embrace. I believe the phrase is: "hoist upon his own petard."

I present the following correspondence (and my dissecting commentary thereon) for the edification, amusement and education of all the Constitutional Militiamen who read the John Doe Times.

-- Mike Vanderboegh, 1 ACR
Editor, The John Doe Times

In a message dated 97-07-13 16:02:20 EDT, you write:

Subj: Re: SAFAN NO. 538. Who is Larry Wayne Harris? -OR- The Coming Holocaust.

Date: 97-07-13 16:02:20 EDT

From: mlindste@mail.clandjop.com (Martin Lindstedt)

To: Mo10Cav@aol.com (Mike Vanderboegh)

At 10:33 AM 7/12/97 -0400, you wrote:

>In a message dated 97-07-12 09:00:11 EDT, you write:

>

>"Who is Larry Wayne Harris?"

>

>Well, in point of fact, he's one of those "hardcorps" neo-Nazis

>you're so fond of singing the praises of. Federal rent-a-Nazi,

>more like.

> -- Mike Vanderboegh

>

(Lindstedt replies:)

Maybe he is. Did I not allow how he was a useful idiot for Freeh's Biologicals Inc.?
But why is it such a big deal to you as to the religious and racial views of a rat?

I have found that a man of the right judges a person by their actions and that a man of the left judges people by what they say or think. Therefore Stalin, Mao and Pol Pot are OK while Adolf Hitler is the anti-Christ. You former flower-children never grow up, do you?

MV's response: I am not a "former flower-child". I am an ex-communist, a fact which I have never made any bones of. "Flower children" smoked dope and swapped sexually transmitted diseases along with their illusions about peace, love and fuzzy socialism. The people I hung around with (and, indeed, that I was myself) were the ideological twins of the neo-Nazis and Phineas Priests: true-believing collectivists who would kill you in a heartbeat if the party leader (read commissar or fuhrer, it makes no difference) ordered it.

I have never apologized for communist murderers such as Stalin, Mao or Pol Pot-- at least not since the late Seventies when the truth about the killing fields destroyed any illusions I had about asian communists (or any others) being little Jeffersonian democrats. The lies and hypocrisy I saw in the communist and socialist movements of my youth are the same in neo-Nazi and racial collectivist groups you admire.

There is no greater anti-communist than an ex-communist. You may rank me as both, thank you very much. Indeed for all your self-proclaimed "realistic" view of the world, it is somewhat astounding that you haven't noticed that Nazis are simply a twisted permutation of the collectivist impulse. They are no better, or worse, than communists. Would you make common cause with communists, or accept them as allies? I would not. Indeed, I think the communists have killed more human beings in this century than Nazis, but that begs the point. It is the Nazis (and their "racialist" fellow packdogs the "Mistaken Identities") that you wish us to ally with. After all, Martin, they call themselves National SOCIALISTS for a reason, you know.

And before you jump to the old lie: "Don't you remember World War II? Nazis are the world's most committed anti-communists!"-- That two collectivist empires seeking hegemony over Europe should tear each other apart is mostly an accident of geography, not principle. Remember the Hitler-Stalin Pact? Did the Poles care which collectivist symbol, the swastika or the hammer-and-sickle, that their murderers wore?

Martin, as someone who was doing clandestine armed political work (albeit for the wrong side) when you were in short britches, I can tell you that I pay attention to both what someone says AND what someone does. "By their works ye shall know them," a preacher told me in my youth. I'm "grown up" enough to recognize the truth in that. I'm curious, though, to know what part of the "works" of the Nazis you don't understand?

I do not see any point to grouping everyone who may not be as advanced in their professed love of blacks, Jews and Hispanics as I might be, politically collectivizing them to my right, and then thrusting them all beyond the pale as not so good as I am. Such an approach, while gratifying to the ego, is rather unproductive. Such reasoning, a staple of Fed and media 'thought,' should be alien to Patriot thinking. I know why the Feds and major media parrot such a line. Why do you?

MV: Again, you mistake the "politically correct" ravings of Dees & Co. with the thrust of my opposition to the neo-Nazis and their "Christian" Ident allies. Ego and political correctness have absolutely nothing to do with it. The enemy of my enemy is not MY friend. Get it? Just because Dees opposes neo-Nazis for money, does not mean someone who opposes them for principle is Dees' friend. Just because the neo-Nazis mouth anti-Administration rhetoric does not make them my friends, either. Not by a long shot.

I don't know what kind of behavior you show to "allies", or you expect them to show to you. My allies are people who I can trust not to stab me in the back. People who I can tie my flank to in the sure and certain notion that they will not break and leave me high and dry. People who would tell me the truth, even though I might not like to hear it, or it reflects poorly on them. People who I would share the last box of ammo with, and who would do the same for me. People I can trust not to get me killed just because their "fuhrer" told them it was time to "change policies."

Most importantly, my allies are people who look at things unsentimentally, whose eyes are not clouded by hate or dogma, by guided by principle. Constitutional principles they are, without regard of race, creed, color or religion. And I'm sure some of my allies are "racist", by definition. So what? By definition the First Amendment gives anyone the right to hate anyone else in this country.

But the point of the rest of the Constitution is to make sure that no one group of "haters" gets to exercise undue negative influence over another to their detriment. I don't care if someone has formed opinions that I haven't about any other group in the country, as long as they adhere to the rules of our Constitutional Republic as laid down in the Constitution. That's why we're called "Constitutional" militiamen and women. (I had to laugh at the hair-splitting, legalese in your essay "There ain't no such thing as a Constitutional Militia." What part of the concept, "Citizens under arms to enforce their Constitutional liberties" don't you understand?) "Haters" and "collectivists" can be two different critters. Haven't you noticed?

Why are you engaged in the current propaganda war, the current kulturkampf, in spreading the notion that the effective Resistance = overt racism and thus a threat to the further decay of this civilization?

MV: "Kulturkampf"? My, we are using big Nazi words. My message, if I have one beyond the headline-driven disclosures of the Oklahoma City bombing conspiracy and coverup, is that "Overt racism" DOES NOT EQUAL "effective resistance." Indeed, if there's a lesson in Oklahoma City it is that your neo-Nazi and Christian Identity parads are completely controlled and thoroughly infiltrated by the Feds, making them "cat's paws" rather than prowling 'jagdpanters." You would ally yourself with people who have allied themselves with the greatest enemy of liberty in this country-- the Clinton Administration.

There is not a neo-Nazi or Christian Identity group that you can name that I could not name a top-level federal informant in (and oft times their control agent). This includes some of the biggest names in "der Kampf" including men who have set up supposed unknown-to-the-Feds "leaderless resistance" cells. What a joke! I do not sell the concept short. Indeed, I spent three years of clandestine organizing in the Constitutional militia movement before I was "outed" by a careless contact. But the neoNazi movement, it's mailing lists, it's phone conversations and it's leaders have all been for sale for the last 30 or 40 years. Dennis Mahon once told me in a phone conversation that there wasn't a man or woman in his "Movement" (which I hope you understand is not the same as mine) that wouldn't sit at home and do nothing if the Feds paid them \$20,000 a year. And you want to make people like this your allies?

You are of sufficient age to recollect that thirty years ago in your area of the country that segregation was a patriotic given. Perhaps the people who you claim to be Neo-Nazis now would have fit in quite well in the South 30 years ago without feeling a need for the more extreme political baggage they carry now. Thirty years ago perhaps it was you who were the socialist, and alien to your section's customs and mores. In which case would it not have been better for you to have gone to work in a Yankee newspaper writing forced-integrationist drivel and otherwise openly pissing on the graves of your Confederate great grand-sires?

MV: Uh, a couple of points here. First, the Klan of the Fifties and Sixties had no truck with neoNazis. Couldn't stand 'em. Why? Well, they might have been racists, but most of them (or their brothers or cousins) had been to Europe in World War II and had no love for the swastika. They had seen it's fruit first hand. Also, again you are making the argument that terrorism and terrorists = effective political resistance. In fact it was the church bombings and assassinations which broke the back of the state's rights movement, although most of its adherents were opposed to terrorism as practiced by the FBI-controlled Ku Klux Klan. Do you think that's some kind of accident? Do you think that by allying yourself with federally-controlled terrorists today that you serve the cause of liberty any better than what happened in the Sixties? Absent the terrorism (which dominated the headlines, fed right into the Northerner's preconceptions if not prejudice about the South and broke the back of the legal resistance to federal power), the state's righters might have had a chance to make their case (or at least give their political leaders a chance to use the doctrine of interposition effectively). Identified in the public mind with terrorists, they could not make the political and legal points necessary to win their case. I happen to believe that enforced legal discrimination was a bad cause to put the Tenth Amendment to, but the fact is that any chance to preserve

the right of the states to deal with their own affairs was destroyed by the federally-controlled terrorists. See any parallels?

Second, they ain't necessarily MY "Confederate great grand-sires," although that doesn't mean I don't honor their sacrifice. I came to Alabama in 1985. By virtue of my sterling personality and spiritual growth, I hope to attain an official Southern green card in another couple of years. I was born in Michigan, shanghaied at an early age and raised in Ohio amongst the "heathen Buckeye". Most of my "great grand-sires" wore the blue, although there was (we think) at least one of our folk on my mother's side of the line who fought for the Confederacy. This apparently does not alienate the numbers of native Alabamians who support my leadership of the 1st Alabama Cavalry Regiment (Constitutional Militia). It may be because I enunciate principles they believe in. It may be because they trust me not do anything that will get them killed without purpose or principle. It may be because no one else was stupid enough to take the job. But there it is. In any case, I piss on no one's grave, save Hitler's and Stalin's, and a few of their collectist buddies now merrily blazing in hell. And I promise you this, I'll piss on Timothy McVeigh's grave and that of every federally-sanctioned neo-Nazi and christian Identity terrorist who killed those 168 people in Oklahoma City the moment they're in the ground. And if you rank yourself as their friend and ally and kill some innocents yourself, I'll piss on yours as well.

The White Nationalist and Christian Identity movements have been hurt as a result of the rascallions you document betraying them and selling them out. For a full decade at least they have borne the brunt of the Resistance and taken the casualties long before the middle-class suburban militia general tried their hand at the game of playing at revolution.

MV: "Rascallions"? Sounds like you need to take a job of neoNazi Counter Intelligence Officer instead of impersonating a liberty-loving militiaman.

Frankly, the militia generals, with their incessant declarations and screeching of love for everyone, have been a considerable disappointment for anyone wanting to get anything serious accomplished.

MV: a. I ain't a general, never claimed to be. b. I don't "love" everyone, but I see the two "declarations" that I've had occasion to author (and that thousands of Constitutional militia folk signed onto) as a good way to delineate the ground you will fight for, and why. c. As far as being a "disappointment" to folks "wanting to get anything serious accomplished." What serious things did you have in mind to accomplish? More OKCs? You want to validate the federal police state, perhaps? Or do you want to skip the Turner Diaries-like repression and go straight to the Day of the Rope? Is Rahowa (racial holy war) what really floats your boat?

The key thing here is, what do YOU want to accomplish, Mr. Lindstedt? I have drawn few conclusions about you from your previous writings save this:

You once wrote, in reference to OKC and other terrorist actions that "There are no innocents". The babies in that daycare weren't innocents, Mr. Lindstedt? The people who visited the federal building, or even the non-law enforcement federal employees weren't innocents, Mr. Lindstedt? What is there about an Agriculture Department employee, that by virtue of the job alone, requires his or her death? The very concept that there ARE innocents in war, that there are laws of land warfare that must be respected by belligerents including the refraining from attacks on innocent civilians is what separates civilized armies from butchering barbaric hordes. The moment you believe, as you apparently do, Mr. Lindstedt, that there are no innocents-- at that moment you become a barbarian. Do you shoot helpless prisoners, too, Mr. Lindstedt? Rape female POWs? Or is killing babies with precisely targeted bombs the end of your own catalog of personally-allowable atrocities?

If I am a "disappointment" to terrorists and barbarians, Mr. Lindstedt, I proudly wear the title.

I asked you before, and still ask you now for a serious debate on recognizing the Christian Identity, White Nationalist, and even Neo-Nazi place in the overall Resistance movement. You have refused. Which is of course your right and is irrelevant in any case. Your refusal to raise your views in any open forum means merely that by default these people will take over the vanguard, as they have already. You are presently coolly viewed as a militia-general collaborator with Morris Dees -- a scalawag narking out your kin for the benefit of federal carpetbaggers.

MV: I guess I should have responded to you before this, but I've been a little busy "narking out" (as you say) for the Constitutional militias your federal-terrorist

partners. Not for Morris Dees, who by the way never lists a federal operation in his literature unless it's to assist his federal overseers in one way or another. (Check for pre-bombing mentions of Elohim City in Klanwatch. A classic case of "the dog who didn't bark.") Morris does not count me as a friend. I am in fact one of his worst enemies, and have done more than most to expose him. Deeswatch, my first on-line effort, has sent hundreds of pounds of Dees-related material via FedEx to people who have been slandered by him and are suing him (or considering same) all over the country.

I guess you may consider this my "serious debate" response. I look forward to more of your defense of the indefensible. It is amusing if nothing else, and very revealing to exactly the people you hope to convert to your line of thinking.

As far as "federal carpetbaggers", I must confess that I have had limited personal experience with the type, almost all of whom are reputed neoNazis and Christian Identity FBI assets, who coincidentally, you spend an awful lot of time defending.

You do not understand and cannot understand the people you write about because you have no empathy for them. That which you do write about the traitors and informants within **our** midst does not detract from **our** views and it adds to **our** unit security. So yes, even you serve a purpose. **We** listen to you, although you are not viewed with any affection or respect. They understand you very well.

-- Martin Lindstedt.

MV: Well, I guess I can rest easy now that I know I "serve a purpose". The "within our midst" quote I guess means that you have dropped all pretense and identify yourself with the neoNazis, et al. I'm glad I've been able to help you come to this self-knowledge, grass-hopper. Of course, I guess I knew it all along, but it's nice to know for the wider audience. I seek neither affection nor respect from the Clintonistas and their neo-Nazi terrorist allies.

You're quite wrong you know. While it is true I have no empathy for your buddies, I understand them all too well. So do 168 Oklahomans I could name.

--Mike Vanderboegh, 1 ACR
Editor, The John Doe Times

[Read on for more of the Outing of A NAZI](#)

18 July 1997

Dear Martin,

Despite your complaint below to Mr. Alexander, the fact is that I have sent copies of my reply directly to both you and PIML. I received your reply to Carl while I was formulating my own reply to him, so instead I will simply cc: him with this because you have, once more, made my point that I am actually casting pearls before neo-Nazi swine, or perhaps a herder of swine.

As I have received from you no direct reply to my missive, can I conclude that you do not dispute my main points?:

1. That you and your friends are indeed collectivists rather than constitutional republicans.
2. That as you believe there are no innocents in warfare, you are barbarians and war criminals-in-embryo awaiting your opportunity to turn the countryside into Serbia-to-the-twelfth-power.
3. You and your friends in fact inhabit another movement entirely than the Constitutional Militia movement, to wit, the "racialist" white separatist/supremacy movement, a white tribalism doppelganger of Tutsis and Hutus, or in the modern American example, Farrakhan's FOI.
4. That that movement is a wholly-controlled subsidiary of the federal administration and has been for years.
5. That were you and your friends (little nazis) ever to change places with the Clinton administration (Big Nazis) that the cause of liberty would be even more mangled than it is today, with an even greater bodycount.
6. That it would be interesting for you to spell out exactly what you believe the world should look like after the "revolution" you seek. You are a self-described "revolutionist", after all.

I have taken the liberty of commenting upon your comments below. They are well marked out, as before.

-- Mike Vanderboegh, 1 ACR

Editor, The John Doe Times

In a message dated 97-07-18 02:51:39 EDT, you write:

<Martin, FYI.
>Carl

Thanks. I got the above from other friends, although not from Vanderboegh or PIML.

--Martin Lindstedt

>
> To: Mo10Cav@aol.com Order #7940572
> From: LVKR94A
>Subject: RE: PIML] MARTIN LINDSTEDT: PR FLACK FOR
> Date: 07/15/97 06:49 AM
>
>Mr. Vanderboegh,
>
> Just finished reading the exchanges between you and Martin Lindstedt,
>and I am rather taken aback - as I have been corresponding with Martin for
>a couple of months now, and had no idea he held any such opinions.
>
"and had no idea he held any such opinions."
What opinions do you deem acceptable, Carl?

MV Comment: Carl's point is, I think, that you never revealed your
collectivist side until pushed. I pushed you, you responded, Carl was
surprised by your reply. I would comment to Carl that this is entirely
consistent with collectivists of all stripes (communist, Nazi and all
shadings in between). They would never tell you anything they felt you
couldn't handle, or had no right to know. Collectivists do not trust the
people to know the truth and make decisions themselves. Collectivists are by
definition manipulators.

> The only thing I know about either of you, is from what I have read of
>your postings to the net (The John Doe Times is excellent, by the way, and
>I look forward to each `issue'). I am wondering however, if there is not a
>certain amount of `personality-clash' occurring here, driving each of you
>towards more extreme positions than you might normally take?

You are somewhat right in the above regard. However, most of the
disagreement is ideological.

I have observed Vanderboegh for some time now. I see how he acts
with others not as excellent with words as I am, and frankly, I have
been waiting for a justification to act with my take upon Vanderboegh.

MV Comment: Martin, you and I share several acquaintances, a couple of
informants, and one friend. I'm told you are a stand up guy with your
friends. You are said to be brave. I have no doubt. I am merely more
careful in my choice of friends. Hitler liked dogs and small children but it

didn't make him humanitarian of the year. Your ideological conclusions are wrong, and based, I think, on the geography where you live, the narrowness of your focus, and a certain Teutonic outlook that may indeed be genetic. If you had experience with the larger picture of resistance to the Administration, you would not be so insular and eager to fall back on friends who are a pitifully small minority of self-marginalized individuals. The "militia generals" which you so rightly despise are self-important little fish who proclaim their part of the pond to be the Atlantic Ocean. Likewise, the neo-nazis, Christian Identity-types, and Kluxers that you hang with get together and make common cause precisely because they are so few they must agree on lowest common denominator beliefs (blacks = mud people, Jews = devil) just to get up a quorum. In your pond, they are perhaps the biggest fish. But the world is wide, and the members of the movement I belong to-- the Constitutional militia movement-- are to be found in every pond, lake, stream and ocean. Indeed, it is our size that the Administration fears.

The point is, you have written that we need allies like the Nastys, the Mistaken Identities, and the Sheethheads to resist the Clinton Administration.

You have misread the size, scope and latent power of the Resistance movement. We don't need them. They need us. They need us for trolling grounds for converts. They need us so that they can hide in our shadow. They need us to make the mistake of making them our allies, because they not only are pitifully outnumbered, but they couldn't fight their way out of a paper bag. I have no doubt that some of them are top-notch assassination teams.

But when the bulk of the Constitutional militia movement mobilizes, any federally-controlled Nazis in the way will either head for the hills or be crushed.

It is not your "excellence with words" that I take issue with, but your slowly-becoming-clear-ideology.

>

> I ask that question because nothing Martin ever said to me, personally, >or in the public posts of his I have seen, ever gave any indication that he >was a 'hater', or a racist, or a facist (of any variety). And yet, after a >long & bitter exchange, his last statements seem to belie that. I find it >hard to believe, that they could have been made from any other motive than >anger.

>

Carl, you don't know me. You don't know what I've lived through, what I've observed.

Suffice it to say that unlike most people I have a reason for about every thing I do, and for the way that I reason.

MV Query: And what, praytell, is that reason?

> Your points concerning the danger from the White Christian Identity/ >Neo-nazi movement are well-taken, Mr. Vanderboegh, and you are correct in >your estimation of the threat they represent to all Patriots. Fanatics and >'true believers' are always dangerous to both their enemies, and their >allies - for the simple reason they have no real allies. If you are not OF >them, and thereby FOR them, then you are ultimately against them. That is >the way they view the world, and everyone in it - no doubt, an extension of

>the paranoidal/pyschotic delusions they operate within.

Carl, will you please listen to yourself, read above your above posting, strip away your sense that you are better than those people you describe, and look how what you said about fanaticism could as easily apply to yourself -- if you let it?

MV: I should think that Carl's appeal for reason and reconciliation, ill-starred though it is, should be prima facie evidence that he is not a fanatic. As far as "stripping away the sense that you are better than the people you describe", I must say Martin that no statement you have made is more revelatory of your collectivist side. What liberal have you not heard wringing-hands over some politically-correct barbarian killer, "Oh but we must UNDERSTAND him (them) and realize we should not be judgemental."? Of course Carl and I are better than Aztec heart-eaters, atavistic barbarian murderers, Nazi concentration camp guards, Bill and Hillary Clinton and any number of collectivists I could name! We have principles. We adhere to the Constitution and the Faith we have. If you choose to be morally-relative and consider yourself no better than them is it because you believe, like them, that they (and you) are "Supermenschen"? Again, I care not what beliefs anyone has, as long as they adhere to the Constitution and do not serve the interest of my oppressors, the Clinton Administration. As your friends serve the interests of my enemies, they cannot be my friends.

Vanderboegh does not have a single ally, a single friend other than himself and the unknown people who made him a militia general.

MV: a.) Again, I am not, nor have I ever claimed to be, a "general" of militia or anything else. b.) The above statement shows either your ignorance of reality, or a propensity to lie about uncomfortable facts. Once again, you are suffering from little pond syndrome.

>

> But Martin Lindstedt has a valid point that he is trying to make, also.
>And as I understand him, it is this - just because a man has been labeled a
>'racist' by the powers that be, as an attempt to smear or discredit him, is
>no reason he should be treated as a pariah, or an outcast, by the Patriot
>Cause.

>

> The enemy of my enemy may be MY enemy, also... but that is not
>necessarily true, Mr. Vanderboegh. There is always a chance, he can turn
>out to be a friend.

>

> And to turn our backs and abandon such a man to the Neo-nazi's, who
>will welcome him with open arms & seek to instill their hatred and their
>worldview into his soul (until like themselves he is beyond redemption)
>is not a wise course of action, Mr. Vanderboegh.

>

I thank you for your worrying about my soul and possibilities of redemption, while at the same time you irritate the hell out of me with your conceit of smugness.

MV: Sorry, Carl, you too, it seems, have cast your pearls before "Schweinen." I concede that there are some folks who are irritated by my blunt presentation. And there is always the danger that writing about things in the aggregate can mischaracterize a specific point, or individual. It is apparent though from Mr. Lindstedt's reply that I was more right about him than you had hoped.

I have observed the Resistance movement and let me tell you that it is the Christian Identity and White Nationalist movements who know what they want, and how they propose to get it.

MV: Oh they sure do, Martin. You're right about that. Turner Diaries, here we come! Thanks for making my point.

What they wish to do is seced from the country and set up a new nation where they will be in the majority. Or are only people like Carol Moore allowed to leave because of their superior morality?

MV: And you find nothing wrong with this, Martin?

Let me ask you this: Who do you think has more influence over the CI and White Nationalists? Myself or Vanderboegh?

MV: Oh, Martin, I concede that you have more influence over CI and White Nationalists (read Nazis). Isn't that rather like being King of the Maggots, however?

For that matter over the Resistance movement?

It is the people who are doing something who are effective. Not those who have subjective reasons as to how they don't like another group of people.

MV: Which of us has more influence in the Resistance movement will be judged by history. Which of our philosophies is more in tune with the aggregate of the Constitutional Militia movement is, I think, obvious right now. You lose.

> Your and Martin's disagreement over the relative worth and `value'
>of various partisan groups in the overall struggle, should not cloud that
>issue. Personally, I believe that those like Butler of the Aryan Nations,
>or Mathews of The Order, have done more to HARM the Patriot cause than help
>it, by alienating enormous numbers of people who would otherwise be more
>actively involved in this struggle.
>

An enormous number of people, undefined, who are not there, who

have the excuse that someone most of them never heard about keeps them from joining the Resistance.

> But be that as it may, it is not sufficient reason for people like you
>and Martin to start ripping each other to shreds in the public forum. We
>should not eat each other alive, Mr. Vanderboegh - for the Patriot cause
>is not well served in that manner, either.

>

> Both you and Mr. Lindstedt are Patriots, in my estimation, though you
>hold differing views about certain issues. That is to be expected, and
>applauded, in any movement whose real purpose is Liberty for all. I respect
>and admire both of you men, whose intellectual & patriotic accomplishments
>are so much greater than my own. But before either of you start picking out
>supporters and choosing up sides, I would urge you both to once again
>LISTEN to what the other is trying to say - not for the sake of argument or
>refutation - but to understand each other, and give credit where credit is
>due.

>

Vanderboegh is no patriot in my estimation. I know his past history.
It isn't good.

I have every intention of putting Vanderboegh in quarantine by
reciting that past history. It is not out of a sense of malice.
It is something which must be done, however.

MV: Whether I am a patriot, or whether Martin can be considered a patriot,
should be judged by the answer to the question, "Patriot" to which country
and what cause?

There is an oath that our Founder's came up with. It's violation by
officeholders large and small is the reason for our troubles today. You know
the one, "Bear true faith and allegiance"... "preserve, protect and defend the
Constitution of the United States".. "against all enemies foreign and
domestic." If that's the standard you judge patriots by, I think history
will judge me a patriot. Martin can speak for himself. Some of his buddies
are the last thing you would think of when you hear the word patriot.

I am curious to know what part of my "past history" there is that Martin
feels somewhat indictable. I urge him to publish it far and wide.

Let's see, it can't be that I'm a "snitch", paid provocateur or other such
slime such as inhabits his friend's "movement." I've never taken a dime of
federal money, am not now, nor never have worked for any federal, state,
local or other law enforcement agency as an employee or "snitch". When John
Parsons was revealed to have taken federal money during my stint on the
Tri-States advisory board, I made sure people knew about it and resigned
quite publicly. No, it can't be he thinks I'm a snitch.

What else could it be? Unlike Martin, I have never claimed to be something
I'm not, nor have I hid any part of my beliefs. I have made it plain to all
that I am an ex-, and very anti-, communist. So what? Martin probably used
to be a member of the Democratic Party when he was growing up. Of course
then he became a Libertarian (much to their regret). I wonder what the
Libertarians would say if he knew that his current buddies would stand them
all against the wall and shoot them if they ever came to power. A
collectivist in libertarian clothing. Now there's something more scandalous

than being an ex-communist.

I do not care about the number of supporters. I do care about their quality and expect to prevail.

MV: Prevail against what and whom seems to be the important question.

> There is a long and difficult road ahead of us, gentlemen. And as
>another Patriot, of another time, once remarked, "We must indeed all hang
>together, or, most assuredly, we shall all hang separately."
>

There is neither trust nor liking present here. I fully expect a knife from Vanderboegh whenever Vanderboegh manages to convince his opposition that they are Nazis. And he does it so often.

--Martin Lindstedt

MV: A good writer merely presents facts and argument in a credible fashion. If he is believed, it may be because he's right.

> Words, quite literally, to live by.
>
> To Liberty, and Justice for all,
>
> Carl Alexander
>

MV: Carl, I too, am fond of the Franklin quote. You must remember, however, that Mr. Lindstedt's friends intend to hang us all before it's over. Indeed, many of them work with, and to the interests of, the big Hangman, Bill Clinton. "Hanging together" with your own Hangman does not, in my estimation, make a whole lot of sense, Thanks for your letter.

-- Mike
